UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,781	11/03/2000	Richard James Humpleman	SAM1.0014A	4957

7590	10/25/2005	

KENNETH L SHERMAN, ESQ.
MYERS DAWES ANDRAS & SHERMAN, LLP
19900 MacARTHUR BLVD., SUITE 1150
IRVINE,, CA 92612

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/709,781	HUMPLEMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *13-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *13,14,21-23,30-32,39-41 and 48* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *15-20, 24-29, 33-38, 42-47* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/15/05, 10/14/05*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 8/15/2005, to the original application and pre-amendment A (paper 3), both filed 11/30/2000, said application is a division of US Application Serial No. 09/104,297 filed 6/24/1998 (pending), with acknowledged provisional application filing dates of 9/22/1997, and 6/25/1997. Applicant has successfully sworn behind the date of 6/11/1997. IDS filed 11/30/2000, 6/11/2002, 10/18/2004, 2/16/2005, 8/15/2005, and 10/14/2005.

2.   Claims 13-48 pending. Claims 13, 22, 31, 40 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/11/2005, and 8/15/2005, have been entered.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   **Claims 15-20, 24-29, 33-38** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness**

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall
> not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 13, 22, 31, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, T. et**

al. (hereinafter Suzuki), Teleoperation of multiple robots through the Internet, 5th IEEE International

Workshop on Robot and Human Communication, November 11-14, 1996, pages 84-89, in view of Home

Control Software, HomeVision by Custom Solutions Inc. (hereinafter HomeVision), October 1996, pages

1-3 (listed on examiner's PTO-892, mailed 8/27/2002).

In regard to independent claim 13, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of

robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki

Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to

Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in

a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since

it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing

Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 13 *"A*

method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the

method comprising the steps of:").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser

interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87

Figure 4; compare with claim 13 *"(a) detecting devices that are currently connected to the home network, said*

devices having at least one controllable function;").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01", and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose "menu creation" for selecting devices. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 13 "(b) creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to activate said controllable function;", and "(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function."). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics aiding in a user's eventual decision.

Although Suzuki teaches a top area menu showing images from each detected device (robot) (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), Suzuki does not specifically teach this as a menu that lists devices accordingly, or providing a list for a user to select to activate controllable functions for a selected device. However, HomeVision teaches a home network GUI comprising a list of devices numbered accordingly, each can be selected for programming action functions in a displayed user interface (HomeVision Figures on pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply HomeVision's device list and GUI input, to the top area of Suzuki's Figure 4, and to Suzuki's "Dialogue Window" and Control Panel, etc., providing Suzuki the benefit of a list for convenient selection purposes and for controlling each device accordingly.

In regard to independent claim 22, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 22 *"A method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:"*).

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices. Suzuki also teaches "Robot's Status Panel" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 22 *"(a) detecting an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;"*).

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01", and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki

Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation

(compare with claim 22 "*(b) creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to activate said*

controllable function;", and "*(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually*

select each device and activate said controllable function."). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki

the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's decision.

Although Suzuki teaches a top area menu showing images from each detected device (robot) (Suzuki

page 87 Figure 4), Suzuki does not specifically teach this as a menu that lists devices accordingly, or providing a

list for a user to select to activate controllable functions for a selected device. However, HomeVision teaches a

home network GUI comprising a list of devices numbered accordingly, each can be selected for programming

action functions in a displayed user interface (HomeVision Figures on pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply HomeVision's device list and GUI input, to

the top area of Suzuki's Figure 4, and to Suzuki's "Dialogue Window" and Control Panel, etc., providing Suzuki

the benefit of a list for convenient selection purposes and for controlling each device accordingly.

In regard to independent claim 31, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of

robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki

Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to

Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in

a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since

it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing

Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 31 "*A home*

network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network,

the method comprising:").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser

interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87

Figure 4; compare with claim 31 *"a detector that detects devices that are currently connected to the home*

network, said devices having at least one controllable function;").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki

also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers

(Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of

robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all

devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices

respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01",

and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches

an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the

capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu

creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each

connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki

Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation

(compare with claim 31 *"a menu generator for creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to*

activate said controllable function;", and *"a browser for displaying said menu on a browser based device for a*

user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function."). The inclusion of a menu

provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's

decision.

Although Suzuki teaches a top area menu showing images from each detected device (robot) (Suzuki

page 87 Figure 4), Suzuki does not specifically teach this as a menu that lists devices accordingly, or providing a

list for a user to select to activate controllable functions for a selected device. However, HomeVision teaches a

home network GUI comprising a list of devices numbered accordingly, each can be selected for programming

action functions in a displayed user interface (HomeVision Figures on pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply HomeVision's device list and GUI input, to

the top area of Suzuki's Figure 4, and to Suzuki's "Dialogue Window" and Control Panel, etc., providing Suzuki

the benefit of a list for convenient selection purposes and for controlling each device accordingly.

In regard to independent claim 40, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of

robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki

Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to

Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in

a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since

it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing

Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 40 *"A home*

network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network,

the method comprising the steps of:").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a

Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices.

Suzuki also teaches "Robot's Status Panel" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 40 *"(a) a detector*

that detects an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at

least one controllable function;").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki

also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers

(Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of

robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all

devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices

respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01",

and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches

an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the

capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu

creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each

connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki

Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation

(compare with claim 40 "*a menu generator that creates a menu for individually selecting said devices to*

activate said controllable function;", and "*a browser for displaying said menu on a browser based device for a*

user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function."). The inclusion of a menu

provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's

decision.

Although Suzuki teaches a top area menu showing images from each detected device (robot) (Suzuki

page 87 Figure 4), Suzuki does not specifically teach this as a menu that lists devices accordingly, or providing a

list for a user to select to activate controllable functions for a selected device. However, HomeVision teaches a

home network GUI comprising a list of devices numbered accordingly, each can be selected for programming

action functions in a displayed user interface (HomeVision Figures on pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply HomeVision's device list and GUI input, to

the top area of Suzuki's Figure 4, and to Suzuki's "Dialogue Window" and Control Panel, etc., providing Suzuki

the benefit of a list for convenient selection purposes and for controlling each device accordingly.

6.   **Claims 14, 23, 32, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki and**

HomeVision, as applied to claims 13, 22, 31, and 40 above, and further in view of Venkatraman et al.

(hereinafter Venkatraman), U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 issued September 1999 (referenced in a previous

action).

In regard to dependent claim 14, Suzuki teaches a Web page interface (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). HomeVision teaches a list of devices for activation (see above). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's menu, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

In regard to dependent claim 23, claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 32, claim 32 reflects the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 41, claim 41 reflects the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

7.   **Claims 21, 30, 39, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki and HomeVision, as applied to claims 13, 22, 31, and 40 above, and further in view of Fisher, Susan E. (hereinafter Fisher), Get Ready For Plug and Play, Datamation, May 1, 1996, pages 62-64.**

In regard to dependent claim 21, Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room, said devices are detected and linked (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach autonomously

detecting devices that become available as currently powered on and connected. However, Fisher teaches "Plug

and Play", whereby peripherals can be attached and recognized on the fly, such as automatic laptop detection of

a powered on docking station when said laptop is docked accordingly (Fisher page 62, left column, paragraphs

1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fisher to

Suzuki, providing Suzuki the benefit of Plug and Play for detecting devices, and hot swapping devices

accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 30, claim 30 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed

in claim 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 39, claim 39 reflects the system comprising computer executable

instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claim 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 48, claim 48 reflects the system comprising computer executable

instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claim 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/2005 (regarding unamended claim limitations) have been fully and

carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Suzuki does not teach the claimed limitations of instant claim 13. In particular

regard to the assertion that although it is possible for a user of Suzuki to operate all robot devices

simultaneously, said user (via the use of the server) is also capable of querying/directing commands to

individual devices via specific unique ID numbers. Although an operator has used wildcards in his query (see

Suzuki Figure 6(a)), nevertheless, said operator of Suzuki is fully capable of targeting a specific robot device

(i.e. inputting and requesting specific robot ID: UgCmVcO1 – see Suzuki Figure 6(b), 6(c)), if necessary.

Whether said targeted device cooperates does not obviate the fact that specific robots can be targeted by an operator to request specific tasks. Further proof can be found via Suzuki's teaching of a user interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Even if it is interpreted that a user cannot enter the specific commands as presented above, Suzuki's invention carries out the initial wishes of a user, and will target a specific device, especially if Suzuki detects only one device to begin with.

Applicant argues that Suzuki does not teach detecting devices that are currently connected to a (home) network. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Suzuki's presentation (Suzuki Figure 4) requires each participating robot to at least be detected by the network in order to read its status (i.e. active, etc.) in the lower right portion of said Figure 4. Applicant asserts that "*In Suzuki, a robot can be connected to the network, without requiring detection of its connection.*". While this may be possibly true in a hardware sense, nevertheless, since the main focus of Suzuki is to communicate with robot devices, detection of available (i.e. currently active) robots is required if communication and cooperation between robots is to occur. The examiner respectfully notes that "*displaying status of a robot*" requires the server to poll said robot over a network for its status.

Applicant asserts that an operator does not select an individual robot, rather, the Operation Module does, as well as not teaching "creating a menu" for selecting devices. It is respectfully noted that Suzuki's presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), at least clearly suggests a menu of robots for interaction with a user. A "menu" in the general sense is merely a listing of available items for selection. Suzuki can at least suggest a menu by its capability to offer a user a list of specific (active) robots for selection (see also Suzuki page 86 column 2, item 2, where it is stated "The operator inputs task commands by selecting items in the menu..."). In addition, Suzuki's teaching of an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user a "menu" of direction buttons for an "individual" robot.

Applicant argues that Suzuki cannot be modified by Venkatraman to place links in Web pages, etc. It is

respectfully noted that both references utilize browsers and the Internet (World Wide Web). Suzuki teaches a

Web page interface, along with the capability of choosing items via clickable object maps (see Suzuki page 86

column 2, item 1). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device.

However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface

functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via

hyperlink. Said teaching provides more localized specific information displayed to an operator (via Suzuki's

graphical interface of Figure 4).

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be

reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather

Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application

or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 23, 2005